UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,664	05/25/2007	Stephen John Kemp	10761.1472-00	7299

81331   7590   08/25/2010
Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson,
Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue
Washington, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
PHAM, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

betty.finley@finnegan.com
dianna.williams@finnegan.com
catherine.vanhouten@finnegan.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 June 2010</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6-10,12,13,15-32 and 34-36* is/are pending in the application.
      4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-32 and 34-36* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth

in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Response to Amendment

2.   The Request for continued Examination, filed on 06/23/2010, has been entered

and acknowledged by the Examiner.   In the Amendment, applicant amended claims 1,

8, 10, 17-19, 21, 23, and 25. Cancelled claims 40-42.

3.   As to Arguments and Remarks filed in the Amendment, please see Examiner's

responses shown after **Rejections - 35 U.S.C § 103**

4.   Please note claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-32 and 34-36 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-28, 30-31, 34, and 35 are rejected under *35*

U.S.C. 103(a) a being unpatentable over Shoup et al (US Patent No. 6108657, herein

Shoup), and further in view of Nwabueze et al. (US Patent 2002/0144174 A1, herein

Nwabueze).

As per claim 1, Shoup discloses:

(currently Amended) A method for generating a multi-dimensional data structure

in order to access data <u>stored at</u> a plurality of data sources (Figure 5, elements 213

and 214, [col. 9, lines 17-53], wherein "The database 214 contains records that are to

be used by the record management system 200 in providing multi-dimensional views"),

(where database 214 stored plurality record of data sources), **said plurality of data**

sources <u>being disparate, having disparate source data structures, and</u> having a

different number of dimensions than said multi-dimensional data structure ([col.

6, lines 5-21], [col. 8, lines 55-60], wherein "generating a multi-dimensional view for a

number of different measures."), **said method comprising:**

          defining at least one dimension and a dimension value associated with the

at least one dimension for said multi-dimensional data structure (Figure 7C, [col. 6,

lines 5-53], e.g., "A number of different dimension values are also represented

throughout the set of records, and each one of the dimension values is associated with

at least one of a number of different dimensions");

          creating a plurality of combinations of dimension values, wherein a

combination defines a data item ([col. 11, lines 33-47], [col. 15, lines 53-67], [col. 16,

lines 36-61], and [col. 17, lines 36-45], Figure 6D, element 263,   e.g., "select dimension value combination"),

wherein the plurality of combinations comprise a first set of data items and a second set of data items (Figure 6d, element 263, [col. 17, lines 22-52], wherein "generates a set of groups of records for the horizontal axis and a set of groups of records for the vertical axis. For each of these axes, the layout engine 212 selects dimension value combinations"), (where "combinations of a first set of data items and a second set of data items" is equivalent to "combinations of set of groups of records" as claimed),

wherein said multi-dimensional data structure is defined by a first set of data items and ([col. 6, lines 13-37], [col. 11, lines 21-32], e.g., "Each dimension index record identifies a dimension value from the master table, an associated dimension, and each record in the master table that contains the dimension value") (where "record identifies a dimension value" which is defined set of data items);

wherein the second set of data items comprises data items associated with the plurality of data sources ([col. 6, lines 13-46], wherein "dimension values are also represented throughout the set of records, and each one of the dimension values is associated with at least one of a number of different dimensions"), (where "dimension values is associated with at least one of dimension" is equivalent to "data items associated with the plurality of data sources");

mapping data items in the first set of data items in said multi-dimensional data structure to corresponding data items in the second set of data items

(Shoup, [col. 6, lines 47-64], [col. 11, lines 15-32], e.g., "Once a layout mapping is

generated, the record management system converts the layout mapping into a multi-

dimensional view. For each cell in the layout mapping, measure results are determined

based on the measure values in the records in each group corresponding to the cell.

The measure results are loaded into the cells, and the multi-dimensional view is

displayed"), (i.e., mapping the records into a multi-dimensional view which is

combines/mapping set of data items);

     determining a location of a gap ([col. 16, lines 45-67], wherein " identifies a set

of records that are identified in each of the dimension index records being compared"),

(where "identified in each of the dimension index" is equivalent to "determining a

location of a gap"), **comprising a difference between the first set of data items and**

the second set of data items (Shoup, [col. 16, lines 62-67], and [col. 17, lines 1-35

and lines 53-67], e.g., "the records identified in the index record comparison (step 264)

is examined....If no records are designated as being in the group, then no group is

created. If at least one record has been designated into the group, then a group is

created for the selected axis") (it is unclear whether the first set of data items and the

second set of data items in the same or different dimension) ;

bridging the gap by at least one of the following:

     obtaining, from one of the <u>plurality of</u> data sources (shoup, figure 7A, [col. 4,

lines 8-16], [col. 12, lines 37-67], wherein "receives the records provided by the

database management system 213 and provides for them to be maintained in the

master table 202 in step 223. Upon maintaining the records in the master table 202, an

indication is provided in the master table 202 that identifies each of the newly entered

records"), (i.e., "receive data from multi-dimensional (plurality of data sources)), **a**

further data item **<u>for mapping to one of the data items in the first set, wherein the</u>**

<u>further data item is</u> not originally obtainable in the second set of data items

(Shoup, figures 10A, 15A, [col. 4, lines 8-16], [col. 13, lines 27-48], [col. 14, lines 1-17],

wherein "The record structure engine 115 then maps the retrieved values into a multi-

dimensional record structure in the multi-dimensional record structure storage unit 119"

and [col. 6, lines 14-21, wherein "each one of the dimension values is associated with at

least one of a number of different dimensions"), (the are multi-dimensions (plurality of

data sources), the data items in the first set of dimension region is not originally

obtainable in the second set of data items of dimension product);

modifying the multi-dimensional data structure to be further defined by the

second set of data items (Figure 6B, element 244, [col. 10, lines 30-67] , [col. 13, lines

42-48], [col. 14, lines 18-54], wherein "updating the master table index 204. After new

records are placed in the master table…then a new dimension index record is created

for the dimension value") (where "updating… the master table index.. a new dimension

index record is created for the dimension value" which is equivalent to modifying the

multi-dimensional data structure defined by the second set of data items);**<u> and</u>**

Shoup does not explicitly disclose **"converting a source data structure in at**

least one of the <u>plurality of</u> data sources into <u>a source</u> data structure defined<u> by</u>

<u>at least one data item in the first set of data items"</u>.

However, Nwabueze, in analogous, discloses converting a source data

structure in at least one of the <u>plurality of</u> data sources into <u>a source</u> data

structure defined <u>by at least one data item in the first set of data items</u>"

(Nwabueze, [0014], [0016], [0017], wherein "includes converting the data types of each

raw data type specific compartment into a single data type so that each processed data

type specific compartment has the same single data type").

Both references (**Shoup** and **Nwabueze**) taught features that were directed to

analogous art and they were directed to the same field of endeavor, such as generating

report.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of **Nwabueze** with the

teaching of **Shoup** to presentation of the uniformly formatted data in the form of user

requested reports. (Nwabueze [0012]).

As per claims 3 and 12, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The method of claim 1, the program storage device of claim 10, wherein said gap

is bridged at said plurality of data sources (Shoup, [col. 11, lines 7-20 and lines 35-

47], [col. 16, lines 45-50], e.g., "Each measure result is loaded into a corresponding cell

in the layout mapping storage unit 205. Once the axis displays are formed and the cells

are loaded, the display unit 206 displays the view that is provided from the converted

layout mapping"), i.e., the system takes into account that there are multiple different

data or dimensions collected from other sources and finds ways to solve such

differences.

As per claim 4, the combination of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The method of claim 1, further comprising defining an attribute and an attribute value associated with the attribute for said multi-dimensional data structure, wherein the attribute is assigned to a single dimension (Shoup, [col. 6, lines 44-64], [col. 9, lines 46-67], e.g., " each cell in the layout mapping, measure results are determined based on the measure values in the records in each group corresponding to the cell" and [col. 13, lines 49-56], e.g., "Each dimension index record identifies a dimension value and the records in the master table 202 that include the dimension value. Each dimension index record also preferably includes an indication of the query that provided each of the identified records").

As per claim 6, the combination of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The method of claim 1, wherein said creating the combinations includes linking two or more dimensions for said combination created (Figure 6B, element 263, [col. 9, lines 17-22], [col. 15, lines 58-67] [col. 21, lines 32-43], e.g., "The record management system 200 is coupled to a database management system 213, which is linked to a database 214. The database 214 contains records that are to be used by the record management system 200 in providing multi-dimensional views" and "multi-dimensional view is created, the record management system 200 determines, in step 226 (FIG. 6(a)), whether the user wishes to have a view created").

As per claim 7, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The method of claim 6, wherein said mapping includes mapping the combination to a data structure for one of the data sources (Shoup, [col. 14, lines 25-54], [col. 17, lines 36-45], e.g., "the selected dimension value, the index engine 211 determines, in step 243, whether a corresponding dimension index record already exists in the master table index 204. If a corresponding dimension index record already exists for the dimension value, then the existing dimension index record is updated in step 244 to identify the selected record" and "multi-dimensional view may be required to have B dimensions on a vertical axis, D dimensions on a horizontal axis, and a measure being displayed in the view…selects dimension value combinations, processes sets of dimension index records for each combination").

As per claims 8, 19 and 25, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose: (currently amended) The method of claim 1, the program storage device of claim 10, the tool of claim 21, further comprising creating a mapping file for historic data conversion, wherein the mapping file is configured to store relationships between data items in historical data sources for use in generating new data items in historical data sources for use in generating new data items from historical data sources (Nwabueze, [0014], [0015], wherein "converting the data types of each raw data type… then the processed data from each processed data type specific compartment is transferred to a temporary database"), (where "each processed**

data is transferred to a temporary database" which is created a mapping file for historic

data conversion).

As per claim 9, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The method of claim 1, further comprising generating a report, wherein said

report is a combination report, a hierarchy report or a mapping report (Figure 17,

[col. 6, lines 6-30], [col. 11, lines 59-65], e.g., "generate a multi-dimensional layout

mapping for the measures to be viewed. The layout mapping includes a set of cells that

are arranged with respect to a set of axes" and [col. 10, lines 11-20], e.g., "The index

engine 211 is responsible for generating and updating the master table index 204. After

new records are placed in the master table 202 in response to a new query, the index

engine 211 reviews each new record").

__Claim 10__ is essentially the same as claim 1 except that they set forth the claimed

invention as a program storage device readable by a machine rather a method,

respectively and correspondingly, therefore is rejected under the same reasons set forth

in rejections of claims 1.

As per claim 13, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The program storage device of claim 10, wherein the method further comprises

defining an attribute and an attribute value associated with the attribute for said

multi-dimensional chart of accounts, wherein the is assigned to a single

dimension (Shoup, [col. 6, lines 44-64], [col. 9, lines 46-67], e.g., " each cell in the

layout mapping, measure results are determined based on the measure values in the

records in each group corresponding to the cell" and [col. 13, lines 49-56], e.g., "Each

dimension index record identifies a dimension value and the records in the master table

202 that include the dimension value. Each dimension index record also preferably

includes an indication of the query that provided each of the identified records").

As per claim 15, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The program storage device of claim 10, wherein said dimension is at least one of

a dimension for a product, an industry classification and a maturity (Shoup, figure

7A-7C], i.e., VCR or TV is one of a dimension for a product).

As per claim 16, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

(original) The program storage device of claim 15, wherein said dimension value

associated with said product dimension is one of corporate loans, mortgages,

home credits and personal loans (Shoup, figure 7A-7C, i.e., year, region, product,

sale which read on the claimed limitation that dimension value associated with

production dimension).

As per claim 17, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

(currently amended) The program storage device of claim 10, wherein method

further comprises linking two or more dimensions for a created combination

(Shoup, [col. 9, lines 17-22], [col. 15, lines 58-67] [col. 21, lines 32-43], [col. 17, lines

36-45], e.g., "The record management system 200 is coupled to a database

management system 213, which is linked to a database 214. The database 214

contains records that are to be used by the record management system 200 in providing

multi-dimensional views" and "selects dimension value combinations, processes sets of

dimension index records for each combination").

As per claim 18, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

(currently amended) The program storage device of claim 17, wherein said

method further comprises mapping a combination for a dimension value to said

plurality of source charts of accounts (Shoup, [col. 14, lines 25-54], [col. 17, lines 36-

45], e.g., "the selected dimension value, the index engine 211 determines, in step 243,

whether a corresponding dimension index record already exists in the master table

index 204. If a corresponding dimension index record already exists for the dimension

value, then the existing dimension index record is updated in step 244 to identify the

selected record" and "generates a set of groups of records for the horizontal axis and a

set of groups of records for the vertical axis. For each of these axes, the layout engine

212 selects dimension value combinations, processes sets of dimension index records

for each combination").

As per claim 20, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The program storage device of claim 10, wherein the method further comprises

generating a report, said report is a combination report, a hierarchy report, or a

mapping report (Figure 17, [col. 6, lines 6-30], [col. 11, lines 59-65], e.g., "generate a multi-dimensional layout mapping for the measures to be viewed. The layout mapping includes a set of cells that are arranged with respect to a set of axes" and [col. 10, lines 11-20], e.g., "The index engine 211 is responsible for generating and updating the master table index 204. After new records are placed in the master table 202 in response to a new query, the index engine 211 reviews each new record").

__Claim 21__ is essentially the same as claim 1 except that they set forth the claimed invention a tool for generating rather a method, respectively and correspondingly, therefore is rejected under the same reasons set forth in rejections of claims 1.

As per claim 22, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:
The tool of claim 21, wherein said tool is in communication with said plurality of data sources via an electronic network (Shoup, [col. 9, lines 24-33], e.g., "the system bus 208 may be extended outside of the record management system 200 and coupled to the database management system 213. Alternatively, the record management system 200 may include a communications peripheral (not shown) which couples the database management system 213 to the record management system 200. The communications peripheral may couple the record management system 200 and the database management system 213 via a communications medium").

As per claim 23, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The tool of claim 21, wherein said gaps are bridged at said plurality of data

sources (Shoup, [col. 11, lines 7-20 and lines 35-47], [col. 16, lines 45-50], e.g., "The

measure values in these records are then retrieved by the layout engine 212 and used

to determine measure results. Each measure result is loaded into a corresponding cell

in the layout mapping storage unit 205. Once the axis displays are formed and the cells

are loaded, the display unit 206 displays the view that is provided from the converted

layout mapping" and "The cells will later be filled with measure results for the measure

being characterized in the view. The cells are designated to correspond to the groups of

records on each axis. Each cell corresponds to a group on each axis"), i.e., the system

takes into account that there are multiple different data or dimensions collected from

other sources and finds ways to solve such differences.

As per claim 24, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The tool of claim 21, wherein said combination module creates the combination

by linking two or more dimensions (Shoup, [col. 9, lines 17-22], [col. 15, lines 58-67]

[col. 21, lines 32-43], e.g., "The record management system 200 is coupled to a

database management system 213, which is linked to a database 214. The database

214 contains records that are to be used by the record management system 200 in

providing multi-dimensional views" and "multi-dimensional view is created, the record

management system 200 determines, in step 226 (FIG. 6(a)), whether the user wishes

to have a view created. The input control unit 201, control engine 209 and display 206

combine to provide the user with an interface for indicating whether a multi-dimensional

view is to be generated").

As per claim 26, the the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

The tool of claim 21, further comprising a report generator for generating a report,

wherein said report is a combination report, a hierarchy report or a mapping

report (Shoup, [col. 6, lines 6-30], e.g., "generate a multi-dimensional layout mapping

for the measures to be viewed. The layout mapping includes a set of cells that are

arranged with respect to a set of axes" and [col. 10, lines 11-20], e.g., "The index engine

211 is responsible for generating and updating the master table index 204. After new

records are placed in the master table 202 in response to a new query, the index engine

211 reviews each new record").

As per claims 27, 30 and 34, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

A method according to claim 1, a program storage device according to claim 10,

a tool according to claim 21, further comprising documenting how the gap was

bridged (Shoup, ([col. 10, lines 11-20], wherein "the database management system 213

is recorded in a query map record")(where "system is recorded in a map record" which

is documenting how the gap was bridged"), further more, [col. 11, lines 7-20 and lines

35-47], [col. 16, lines 45-50], e.g., "Each measure result is loaded into a corresponding

cell in the layout mapping storage unit 205. Once the axis displays are formed and the

cells are loaded, the display unit 206 displays the view that is provided from the

converted layout mapping" and "The cells will later be filled with measure results for the

measure being characterized in the view. The cells are designated to correspond to the

groups of records on each axis. Each cell corresponds to a group on each axis"), i.e.,

the system takes into account that there are multiple different data or dimensions

collected from other sources and finds ways to solve such differences.

As per claim 28, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

A method according to claim 1, wherein the multi-dimensional data structure

comprises a centralized database (Shoup, [figure 5], [col. 9, lines 16-46], wherein

illustrates a multi-dimensional data structure and is centralized database).

As per claim 31, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

A program storage device according to claim 10, wherein the multidimensional

chart of accounts comprises a centralized database (Shoup, [figure 5], [col. 9, lines

16-46], wherein illustrates a multi-dimensional data structure and is centralized

database).

As per claim 35, the combine of Shoup and Nwabueze disclose:

 A tool according to claim 21, wherein the multi-dimensional data structure

comprises a centralized database (Shoup, [figure 5], [col. 9, lines 16-46], wherein

illustrates a multi-dimensional data structure and is centralized database).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   *Claims 29, 32 and 36 are rejected under 35* U.S.C. 103(a) a being unpatentable

over Shoup et al (US Patent No. 6108657, herein Shoup), and further in view of

Nwabueze et al. (US Patent 2002/0144174 A1, herein Nwabueze), as applied to claims

11, 3, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-28, 30-31, 34, and 35 above, and further in view of Diamond

et al. (US PGPUB 20020116299, herein Diamond).

As per claims 29, 32, and 36, the combine Shoup and Nwabueze do not

disclose:

wherein the centralized database is located at a central office.

       However Diamond, in an analogous art, discloses **wherein the centralized**

database is located at a central office (Diamond, [0056], [0057], e.g., "The local data

492 is periodically transmitted through the interface connection 506 to the central office,

either through actions of the user or automatically, and is stored in the central office

database 510"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Diamond with

the teaching of Shoup and Nwabueze to uploaded to a central database, which collects

data from terminals in various remote locations (Diamond, [0057]) .

Response to Arguments

9.   The Examiner respectfully reminds applicant of the broadest reasonable

interpretation standard (See MPEP 2111), "During examination, the claims must be

interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow." *In re American Academy of*

Science Tech Center, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir. 2004)

(The USPTO uses a different standard for construing claims than that used by district

courts; during examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable

interpretation.) In *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir.

2005), the court further elaborated on the "broadest reasonable interpretation" standard

and recognized that "The Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") determines the scope of

claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon

giving claims their broadest reasonable construction." Thus, when interpreting claims,

the courts have held that Examiners should (1) interpret claim terms as broadly as their

terms reasonably allows *and* (2) interpret claim phrases as broadly as their construction

reasonably allows.

10.   Applicant's arguments filed 06/23/2010 with respect to claims 1, 3, 6-10, 12, 13,

15-27, 29-31, 34, and 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection necessitated by applicant's amendment to the claims. Applicant's

newly amended features are taught implicitly, expressly, or impliedly by the prior art of

record (See the new ground(s) of rejection set forth herein above).

- **Issue I:** Applicants argued on page 14 (Remarks) that Shoup fails to disclose "accessing data stored at a plurality of data sources that disparate and has disparate source data structures".

- **Response:** The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants' argument because Shoup discloses "accessing data stored at a plurality of data sources that disparate and has disparate source data structures" ([col. 1, lines 14-21], wherein "storing, accessing, and manipulating the records", further more, Figure 5, elements 213 and 214, [col. 9, lines 17-53], wherein "The database 214 contains records that are to be used by the record management system 200 in providing multi-dimensional views").

- **Issue II:** Applicants argued on page 14 (Remarks) that fails to discloses:

  "bridging the gap by … obtaining, from one of the plurality of data sources, a further data item for mapping to one of the data items in the first set, wherein the further data item is not originally obtainable in the second set of data items and is generated from one ore more of the plurality of data sources";

  "bridging the gap by … modifying the multi-dimensional data structure to be further defined by the second set of data items"; and

  "bridging the gap by …. Converting a source data structure in at least one of the plurality of data sources into a source data structure defined by at least one data item in the first set of data items."

It should be noted that the claim language recited "at least one of", so it is only required one of the three steps.

The examiner only response to applicant arguments regarding to **one** of above mentioned steps.

- **Response II:** The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants' argument because Shoup discloses "bridging the gap by … modifying the multi-dimensional data structure to be further defined by the second set of data items" (Figure 6B, element 244, [col. 10, lines 30-67], [col. 13, lines 42-48], [col. 14, lines 18-54], wherein "updating the master table index 204. After new records are placed in the master table…then a new dimension index record is created for the dimension value") (where "updating… the master table index.. a new dimension index record is created for the dimension value" which is equivalent to modifying the multi-dimensional data structure defined by the second set of data items).

- **Issue III:** Applicants argued on first paragraph of page 20 (Remark) that Shoup fails to teach or suggest "creating a mapping file for historic data conservation".

- **Response III:** Please see new ground rejection above.

- **Issue IV**: Applicants argued on first paragraph of page 22 (Remark) that Shoup fails to teach or suggest "documenting how the gap is bridged".

- **Response IV:** The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants' argument because Shoup discloses documenting how the gap is bridged"

Shoup, ([col. 10, lines 11-20], wherein "the database management system

213 is recorded in a query map record")(where "system is recorded in a

map record" which is documenting how the gap was bridged"), further

more, [col. 11, lines 7-20 and lines 35-47], [col. 16, lines 45-50], e.g.,

"Each measure result is loaded into a corresponding cell in the layout

mapping storage unit 205. Once the axis displays are formed and the cells

are loaded, the display unit 206 displays the view that is provided from the

converted layout mapping" and "The cells will later be filled with measure

results for the measure being characterized in the view. The cells are

designated to correspond to the groups of records on each axis. Each cell

corresponds to a group on each axis"), i.e., the system takes into account

that there are multiple different data or dimensions collected from other

sources and finds ways to solve such differences.

Examiner Notices

11.   The claimed invention in light of the instant specification discloses generating a

report by consolidating / integrating data of different dimensions collected from multiple /

distributed / multi-node data sources or databases.

Unless the applicants specify what constitutes "bridging the gap" and "gap", the

claimed invention can be interpreted as collecting different values from different

dimensions (from multiple sources) by examining / comparing / determining / mapping /

colligating / associating one company's dimension values with other companies' dimension values.

If applicant would like the examiner to consideration all the steps in the independent claims, the examiner suggests that applicants remove the phrase "at least one of" in the claim language. Also, the examiner suggests that applicants consider incorporating the dependent claims 8 and 27 into independent claim 1, and other dependent claims into the other independent claims. The examiner suggests that applicants clarify the limitation "combination data items" in the independent claims to reflect the intended meaning specified by pages 26 and 27 (such as combination of data types). Similarly, the claims 27, 30 and 34 need further elaboration.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See form 892.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUAN PHAM whose telephone number is (571)270-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday (8:00am - 4:30pm) EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (517)272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TUAN PHAM/
Examiner, Art Unit 2163
08/17/2010

/don wong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163